



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,844	02/25/2004	John Douglas Method	104402.00017	2952
74739 7590 05/28/2010 Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P. Oracle International Corporation 8000 Towers Crescent Drive 14th Floor Vienna, VA 22182				
EXAMINER KEATON, SHERROD L				
ART UNIT 2175		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 05/28/2010		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ipgeneraltyc@ssd.com
bgoldsmith@ssd.com
smcvean@ssd.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/786,844

Applicant(s)

METHOT, JOHN DOUGLAS

Examiner

SHERROD KEATON

Art Unit

2175

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 February 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 12, 15-18, 20-25 and 27-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 12, 15-18, 20-25 and 27-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ ~~Notice of Informal Patent Application~~
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the filing on 2-24-2010. Claims 2-11, 13-14, 19, 26 have been canceled and Claims 1, 12, 15-18, 20-25 and 27-36 are pending and have been considered below:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 12, 15-18, 21-26, 27-31 and 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coulthard et al ("Coulthard" 2004003091 A1) in view of Adams et al. ("Adams" Help-Part 1 Contributing a little help, 8-9-2002) and Cohen (US 7024658 B1).

Claim 1: Coulthard discloses a system executed by a processor, for extending online help for an integrated development environment comprising:

A help system configured to merge documentation content of an integrated development environment extension with current documentation content of the integrated development environment upon import of the integrated development environment into the integrated environment, wherein the help system includes context-sensitive help topics and

Help display wherein search capabilities and table of contents are automatically updated to reflect the documentation content after the integrated development environment is imported,

Wherein the documentation content for the integrated development environment extension is integrated with the help system during the import of the integrated development environment extension and wherein the help system is integrated with an extension installation mechanism of the integrated development environment.

Coulthard discloses an Eclipse system which provides a help system with documentation for an integrated development environment. The help system provides a extension installation mechanism because it allows plug-ins (imports) to be installed within the help system (Page 2, Paragraph 8). Adams has been incorporated because it provides further details about the functionality of the Eclipse help plug-ins. Adams discloses that Eclipse allows context sensitive help (summary), a help with a table of contents (Page 3, creating a book) and integrating the help into the Eclipse help system (Page 5, Help Figure). Therefore it would have been obvious that the Eclipse system of

Coulthard be able to include the functionality of the Eclipse system in Adams. One would have been motivated to provide the functionality in Coulthard as taught by Adams in order to enhance the help system.

However, Coulthard does not explicitly disclose the help display being configured to display content in a web browser. However Cohen discloses an extensible help facility for a computer software application and further discloses the help system being configured to display content in a web browser (Column 2, Lines 3-13). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill at the time of the invention to display content in a web browser of the modified Chan as taught by Cohen. One would have been motivated to include the help display content in a web browser in order to allow user access multiple help files through hyperlinked pages.

Claim 12: Coulthard, Adams and Cohen disclose an extension as an IDE extension as in Claim 1 above and Cohen further discloses an extensible help facility for a computer software application and further discloses the help system being externally controllable (Column 3, Lines 5-20).

Claim 15: Coulthard, Adams and Cohen disclose a help system including context-sensitive help topics as in Claim 1 above and further disclose that help topics are organized by a context ID (Coulthard: Page 2, Paragraph 8).

Claim 16: Coulthard, Adams and Cohen disclose that help topics are organized by a context ID as in Claim 15 above and further disclose the context ID is a fully qualified Java class (Coulthard: Page 1, Paragraph 6). System shows the ability to utilize java resources.

Claim 17: Coulthard, Adams and Cohen disclose that help topics are organized by a context ID as in Claim 15 above and further disclose the context ID is a fully qualified name from a non-Java resource (Coulthard: Page 1, Paragraph 6). System shows the ability to utilize non-java resources.

Claim 18: Coulthard, Adams and Cohen disclose a system as in claim 1 above wherein the documentation content is in HTML or XML format (Coulthard: Page 2, Paragraph 8).

Claim 21: Coulthard, Adams and Cohen disclose a system as in Claim 1 above wherein the IDE widgets, controls, and control properties are associated with the

documentation topics that can be automatically displayed in the help system when requested by a user performing a context sensitive help gesture (Coulthard: Page 2, Paragraph 8).

Claim 22: Coulthard, Adams and Cohen disclose a system of claim 1 and further disclose wherein a control is installed, documentation for the control is integrated with the help system during the installation of the control (Cohen: Column 9, Line 60-Column 10, Line 54). Here the system allows for imports and updates without restarting the application (dynamic) meaning that the data is imported during integration.

Claim 23: Coulthard, Adams and Cohen disclose a system of claim 1 and further disclose wherein each control class, method, callback, field and property has a unique context ID. (Cohen: Column 8, Line 53-Column 9, Line 15). Here code is provided that defines the content, layout etc. therefore the data included in that file will contain unique context ID for that particular content.

Claim 24: Coulthard, Adams and Cohen disclose a system of claim 1 and further disclose wherein the integrated development environment issues a context id to the help display when a context-sensitive help gesture is performed. (Cohen: Column 8, Line 53-Column 9, Line 15). Here code is provided that defines the content, layout etc. therefore the data included in that file will contain unique context ID for that particular content allowing for context sensitive help.

Claim 25: Is similar in scope to Claim 1 and therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 26: Is similar in scope to Claim 9 and therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 27: Is similar in scope to Claim 12 and therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 28: Is similar in scope to Claim 15 and therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 29: Is similar in scope to Claim 16 and therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 30: Is similar in scope to Claim 17 and therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 31: Is similar in scope to Claim 18 and therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 33: Is similar in scope to Claim 21 and therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 34: Is similar in scope to Claim 22 and therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 35: Is similar in scope to Claim 23 and therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 36: Is similar in scope to Claim 24 and therefore rejected under the same rationale.

3. Claims 20 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coulthard et al ("Coulthard" 2004003091 A1) in view of Cohen (US 7024658 B1) and Adams et al. ("Adams" Help-Part 1 Contributing a little help, 8-9-2002) as applied to claim 1 in further view of Chong et al ("Chong" US 20020184610 A1)

Claim 20: Coulthard, Adams and Cohen disclose a system as in Claim 1 above but do not explicitly disclose that the documentation content can support delivery of help for a particular component in a JAR file. However Chong discloses that component can support a JAR file (Page 30, Paragraph 436). Therefore it would have been obvious to

one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide documentation of the modified Coulthard to support a JAR file as taught by Chong. One would have been motivated to provide this support to improve functionality and operability of the system.

Claim 32: Is similar in scope to Claim 20 and therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Examiner believes that the Eclipse Help System does disclose the functionality of the claims and Adams has been provided to further expound on the Eclipse Help System. Second, applicant has argued that prior art of record does not disclose updating search capabilities. Examiner disagrees. The understanding is that if the system is context sensitive once the new data is provided the ability to search for that information is also provided (adams). There is no need to provide the data if the system does not allow the user to search the newly installed information. If applicant wishes to further clarify the meaning of search capabilities (i.e. Boolean search) they are invented to provide this language in the claim. Also Adams discloses that the plug-in is provided at the extension point and the system installs data into the help system and integrates it with

table of contents. Neither references disclose that they require user to provide an additional manual interaction with the extension.

Conclusion

Applicants amendments necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this office action.

Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sherrod Keaton whose telephone number is 571) 270-1697. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. and alternating Fri. off (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Bashore can be reached on 571-272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3800.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SLK

5-15-2010

/William L. Bashore/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175